

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 1, 2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 as containing new matter. Applicant traverses the rejection, but has amended the claims to obviate the rejection.

The only rejection remaining in the application is a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Specifically, on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 10 and 17 as containing new subject matter because they stated "a plurality of N-best part-of-speech (POS) sequences...". Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection, but has amended the claims to obviate the rejection.

Applicant submits that providing a plurality of POS sequences is well supported by the specification and the claims as originally filed. For example, claim 1 as originally filed referred to identifying N-best POS sequences". Claim 2 referred to identifying baseNP sequences "for each of the N-best POS tag sequences". Claim 9 referred to calculating a probability of each "of the N-best POS "sequences". Claim 10 refers to receiving "N-best part-of-speech (POS) tag sequences" and identifying a likely baseNP sequence "given the N-best POS tag sequences". Claim 17 included identifying "N-best part-of-speech (POS) sequences" and identifying one or more baseNPs "for each of the N-best POS sequences to form a plurality of different possible baseNP sequences...". In addition, the summary of the invention discloses a POS tagger that identifies "N-best part-of-speech (POS) tag sequences corresponding to the linguistic input." See summary, page 4, lines 13-15. Page 13, lines 19-23 specifically disclose a plurality of N-best POS tag sequences corresponding to an input sentence. Equations 2 and 3 are explained in greater detail on page 14, lines 3-6 which specifically refer to "determining the best baseNP sequence for those POS sequences using Equation [3]". Page 15, lines 8-11

also describe the model in greater detail by stating "this model thus outputs the N-best POS sequences for the given natural language input." Page 17, lines 2-6 refer to the statistical model determining "a likely base NP given all of the N-best possible POS tag sequences corresponding to the natural language input...". Emphasis in all above quotations is added.

Thus, Applicant submits that the claims which refer to a plurality of POS sequences, where those sequences are the N-best sequences, are fully supported by the original claims and the original specification. However, Applicant also submits that, after reviewing the claims, the plurality of POS tag sequences is clearly set forth in the claims as they were originally filed and so the amendments are unneeded. Therefore, Applicant has simply cancelled the language referred to by the Examiner in independent claims 1, 10 and 17 to obviate the rejection.

In sum, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph has been overcome. That being the only rejection remaining in the case, Applicant submits that the claims are allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg